

**Draft Summary of the Recreation and Socioeconomics Work Group Meeting
Oroville Facilities Relicensing (FERC Project No. 2100)
July 26, 2001**

The Department of Water Resources (DWR) hosted the Recreation and Socioeconomics Work Group meeting on July 26, 2001 in Oroville.

A summary of the discussions, decisions made, and action items is provided below. This summary is not intended to be a transcript, analysis of the meeting, or to indicate agreement or disagreement with any of the items summarized, except where expressly stated. The intent is to present an informational summary of the discussions for interested parties who could not attend the meeting.

Introduction

Attendees were welcomed to the Recreation and Socioeconomics Work Group meeting. The meeting objectives were discussed. Meeting agenda and list of meeting attendees and their affiliations are appended to this summary as Attachments 1 and 2, respectively. Flip chart notes taken during the meeting are included as Attachment 3.

The Facilitator noted that many participants in the Recreation and Socioeconomics Work Group took part in a guided site tour earlier in the day, visiting many of the project recreation features including Bidwell Marina, Loafer Creek facilities, Diversion Pool, Lime Saddle Marina, Nelson Bar Car Top Boat Launch, North Thermalito Forebay, proposed Riverbend Park site, and the Oroville Wildlife Area. The group stopped for lunch at the new Lime Saddle Campground. She indicated that additional tours could be organized if the participants have an interest in doing so.

The Facilitator reviewed the current relicensing schedule and the status of Recreation & Socioeconomics Work Group activities to date. She reported that Issue Sheets have been revised based on comments received from participants and include updated resource goals, geographic scope, and draft existing information and information needs. Draft study plans should be completed by December to meet the target date of early 2002 to begin field studies. She added that Issue Statements regarding recreation and socioeconomic issues have been forwarded to the Plenary Group and are being evaluated as part of their Scoping Document 1 review.

Action Items – June 28, 2001 Recreation and Socioeconomics Work Group Meeting

A summary of the June 28, 2001 Recreation and Socioeconomics Work Group is posted on the project web site. The Facilitator reviewed the status of action items from that meeting as follows:

Action Item #R24: Present revised Riverbend Presentation to the Plenary Group for their consideration.

Status: Dale Hoffman-Floerke from DWR reported that a revised Riverbend Park presentation was made to the Plenary Group. She added that the information was generally well received. For many, this was the first time they had seen any substantive information regarding the project and several indicated they would not be able to make any decisions regarding the proposal until they had a chance to consult with the groups they represent. Several participants indicated that they would require additional information about the project to share with their groups. There was also a desire expressed that any agreement on Riverbend Park would be included in the settlement agreements as part of the FERC license application. The Plenary Group tasked Ward Tabor with developing a draft settlement agreement

proposal for Riverbend Park for review at the August Plenary Group meeting.

Dale also reported that several of the State Water Contractors requested information on the remaining Interim Projects be developed to provide a comparison for the Riverbend Park project. They expressed discomfort with approving Riverbend Park until the status of the remaining Interim Projects was developed. Several Riverbend Park proponents viewed this as a delaying tactic; however State Water Contractors representatives countered that their boards would not likely support the project without additional information on the entire package of interim projects. The Plenary Group established a timeline for taking final action on the project with a decision targeted for their December 2001 meeting. Pete Dangermond, representing the Interim Projects Task Force, agreed to provide the Riverbend Park presentation to the State Water Contractors and DWR upper management.

Action Item #R25: Reconvene Recreation and Socioeconomics Interim Projects Task Force to develop and execute a strategy for addressing the remaining interim projects. Report back to the Recreation and Socioeconomics Work Group at July 26 meeting.

Status: Dale Hoffman-Floerke reported that Interim Projects Task Force had meet on July 10 to review DPR projects previously left out of the evaluation process and develop additional evaluation criteria for the remaining Interim Projects. Task Force review of the projects resulted in five of the DPR projects being included in the Interim Projects list.

In response to the request to draft additional criteria for evaluating Interim Projects, the Task Force established a sub-Task Force consisting of Pete Dangermond, Dale Hoffman-Floerke, Craig Jones, and the Facilitator. The sub-Task Force met and began developing a criteria strategy based on aggregating the remaining Interim Projects into groups with similar characteristics. Dale reported that the Interim Projects Task Force felt that it would take less time to gather data on a smaller grouping of projects than the entire list of 42 projects. Pete Dangermond added that the sub-Task Force had focused on developing a set of comparative criteria that would be reasonably simple to implement, and present the Work Group with the least number of decision points. The Interim Projects Task Force at their August 7 meeting will review the criteria. One participant pointed out that he had missed the last couple of Interim Project Task Force meetings but was still interested in reviewing the criteria. He suggested that the criteria developed by the Interim Projects sub-Task Force be distributed to everyone that had attended an Interim Projects Task Force meeting (not just the last one) for review prior to the next scheduled Interim Project Task Force meeting. DWR agreed that when completed, the criteria would be distributed to the entire Interim Project Task Force list.

Responding to a participant question regarding FERC's position on interim projects, Jon Cofrancesco from FERC said in general, the group should be looking at the greatest needs and getting the greatest benefit for the dollars invested. Interim Projects can be handled in different ways; some may not require FERC involvement while others may require an amendment to the existing license. Dale responded that projects triggering an amendment, high implementation costs, or requiring extensive environmental documentation did not make the list (with the exception of Riverbend Park).

Pete Dangermond added that the highest priority Interim Projects would likely be ones that need the least additional information and the list could probably be reduced to 10 or 12 projects.

Dale stated that aggregating the Interim Projects into packages addresses one of the concerns of the State Water Contractors and promotes a group of projects rather than just Riverbend Park.

The Work Group discussed at length Riverbend Park status and how it relates to the other Interim Projects. There was some disagreement that the project fits the broad guidelines established for interim projects but most agreed that Riverbend Project is a special case, and should proceed to a decision quickly. Project proponents voiced concern that continuing detailed analysis of the remaining Interim Projects would take Riverbend Park off the "fast-track". The Recreation and Socioeconomics Work Group was reminded that for many of the State Water Contractors having a decision from DWR by December was "fast-track".

Action Item #R26: Review revised Issue Sheets and provide comments to the consultants.
Status: A review of the revised Issue Sheets is included in tonight's agenda.

Issue Sheet Development

Revised Issue Sheets were distributed to the Recreation and Socioeconomics Work Group for their review and comment. Participants were reminded that Issue Sheets are working documents to use while developing study plans. The Facilitator also reminded the Recreation and Socioeconomics Work Group that Issue Statements have been passed on to the Plenary Group and were currently being evaluated as part of their review of Scoping Document 1.

The Revised Issue Sheets with draft existing information and information needs, including comments from this meeting are appended to this document as Attachment 4.

The Recreation and Socioeconomics Work Group reviewed revised Issue Sheets R1, R2, R3, R4 and R5 during this meeting. Craig Jones suggested that Issue Sheets R5 and R6 appear to describe outcomes rather than generate study plans and he suggested the participants think about a strategy to deal with Issue Sheets that may not generate studies but may become part of settlement agreements in the future. The Facilitator responded that by working through their Issue Sheets, other Work Groups had also identified some that did not generate studies. In some instances, they had fashioned language that either resolved the issue statement or described when the issue might be addressed further along in the process.

Dale Hoffman-Floerke suggested that a Study Development Task Force be initiated, composed of participants with some recreation planning background, to synthesize the existing information and information needs for all the Issue Statements. Participants agreed to create a Study Development Task Force to devise a strategy for collecting needed information, and to compile a master list of existing information resources for all Issue Sheets. The Recreation and Socioeconomics Work Group agreed that the Study Development Task Force would then begin developing draft study plans for Work Group review. Study Development Task Force members should include: Pete Dangermond, Ron Davis, Patricia Watters, USFS staff (Tricia Humphreys?), DWR Staff (1), Consulting Team (1), DPR Staff (1), and NPS (Harry Williamson).

- One participant asked if Recreation and Socioeconomics Work Group members could provide additional information needs. Dale responded that anyone could provide input. She requested that all input be forwarded to DWR by August 8 so the Study Development Task Force would

have it for their first meeting. Contact information is included in the Flip Chart notes in Appendix 3.

- One participant suggested the revised Issue Sheets be reviewed in reverse order starting with Socioeconomics at the next Recreation and Socioeconomics Work Group meeting.
- The Recreation and Socioeconomics Work Group asked that all resource documents included in the existing information sections of the Issue Sheets be included in the Project Document Repository at the Oroville Public Library.

Next Meeting

The Recreation and Socioeconomics Work Group agreed to meet on Thursday, August 23, 2001 from 6:00 PM to 10:00 PM at the Oro Health Club.

DWR noted that the originally scheduled September Recreation and Socioeconomics Work Group meeting date conflicts with prior commitments for all DWR environmental staff and requested that an alternate date be chosen. The participants agreed to reschedule their September meeting to October 4.

Next Steps

A suggestion was made to develop a water-based tour of recreation facilities for the fall or spring 2002. Participants agreed this would be useful and DWR suggested such a tour be discussed at a later meeting.

Agreements Made

1. The Recreation and Socioeconomics Work Group agreed to form a Study Development Task Force to develop a strategy for collecting needed information, compile a master list of existing information resources for all Issue Sheets and begin developing draft study plans for Recreation and Socioeconomics Work Group review.
2. The Recreation and Socioeconomics Work Group agreed to move their September Meeting to October 4.
3. The Recreation and Socioeconomics Work Group agreed to meet again on August 23, 2001 from 6 PM to 10 PM at the Oro Health Club.

Homework

The Recreation and Socioeconomics Work Group agreed to review the provided revised Issue Sheets developed by the consulting team and provide any additional input to DWR by August 8, 2001.

Action Items

The following list of action items identified by the Recreation and Socioeconomics Work Group includes a description of the action, the participant responsible for the action, and item status.

Action Item #R27: Provide "existing information" to the Project Document Repository at the Oroville Public Library.

Responsible: DWR Staff

Due Date: On-going

Action Item #R28: Provide sub-Task Force draft screening criteria for Interim Projects to entire Interim Project Task Force list prior to next meeting.

Responsible: Interim Project Sub-Task Force/DWR

Due Date: August 7, 2001

Action Item #R29: Review revised Issue Sheets and provide additional information to DWR.
Responsible: Recreation and Socioeconomics Work Group
Due Date: August 8, 2001